DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 436 222 JC 990 692

TITLE	Evaluation Report: San Joaquin Delta College. Accreditation Report.
INSTITUTION	San Joaquin Delta Coll., Stockton, CA.
PUB DATE	1996-00-00
NOTE	27p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Community Colleges; Educational Administration; *Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Educational Quality; *Institutional Evaluation; Quality Control; School Effectiveness; *Standards; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*San Joaquin Delta College CA

ABSTRACT

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996 for the purpose of validating the college's application for reaffirmation of accreditation. Overall, the team was impressed with the high level of quality inherent throughout the college. However, the team identified a number of institutional shortcomings relative to the accreditation standards. Findings are detailed in the responses to the recommendations of the previous team, observations, conclusions and recommendations under each of the eight standard areas, which are institutional integrity, purposes, planning and effectiveness; educational programs; student services and the co-curricular learning environment; faculty and staff; library and learning resources; physical resources; financial resources; and government and administration. The most serious shortcomings which must be addressed by the college are outlined as follows: The college has made little or no progress in responding to many of the recommendations identified in the 1990 Accreditation Evaluation Report. Because of conflicts over shared governance, a growing list of planning, evaluation, and decision-making issues are not being effectively addressed. A systematic and integrated process of planning and evaluation, which involves all segments of the campus community and influences the acquisition and allocation of resources, does not exist. (VWC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 436 222

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

L. M. Horton

EVALUATION REPORT

SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

Mailing Address: 5151 Pacific Avenue, Stockton, CA 95207 USA
Phone: (209) 954-5151
Fax: (209) 954-5600

TC 990692

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION REPORT
SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited

San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

John D. Hurd, Chairperson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Team Members

Introduction and Summary

Standard I - Institutional Integrity, Purposes, Planning and Effectiveness

Standard II - Educational Programs

Standard III - Student Services and the Co-Curricular Learning Environment

Standard IV - Faculty and Staff

Standard V - Library and Learning Resources

Standard VI - Physical Resources

Standard VII - Financial Resources

Standard VIII - Governance and Administration

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team tnat visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

TEAM MEMBERS

Mr. John Hurd (CHAIRPERSON) - Superintendent/President, Cabrillo College

Ms. Cheryl Zozaya (ASSISTANT) - Confidential Executive Assistant to the President

Dr. Sandy Acebo - Vice President, Instruction, De Anza College

Ms. Donna Arnold - Director, Matriculation/Transfer Center, Southwestern College

Dr. Robert Barr - Director, Institutional Research and Planning, Palomar College

Mr. Daniel Bequette - Professor, Business and Real Estate, Hartnell College

Dr. Dorothy Berger - Chair, English Department, San Diego Mesa Colleg

Mr. William Corey - Trustee, Contra Costa Community College District

Ms. Sally Flotho - Librarian, Golden West College

Dr. Jeanne Hamilton - Vice President, Student Services, Citrus College

Dr. Jose Ortiz - Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, Solano Community College

Dr. John Roberts - Vice President, Business Services, Santa Rosa Junior College

ACCREDITATION VISIT

SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLEGE

March 25-28, 1996

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The San Joaquin Delta Community College District serves a 2,400 square mile area that includes most of San Joaquin County and parts of five other counties. In the fall of 1995, 17,975 students attended San Joaquin Delta College. The campus, built in the 1970's, is located on 146 acres in the northwest section of the City of Stockton. In addition to the main campus, the college offers instruction at 22 off campus locations, and operates an educational farm on 160 acres near Manteca. The District population is characterized by rapid growth, expanding ethnic diversity and high unemployment.

From March 26 to March 28, 1996, a 12 member accreditation team visited San Joaquin Delta College for the purpose of validating the college's application for reaffirmation of accreditation. In preparation for the visit, team members attended Accreditation Commission orientation/training workshops, studied the Commission Handbook for Evaluators, carefully read the college's self-study and related materials, and reviewed the previous accreditation report and recommendations. Two weeks prior to arriving on campus, each team member prepared written reactions to the self-study and questions to be raised during the visit. Over 80 appointments were scheduled by the team members prior to the visit. On March 25, the team met to collectively review the self-study report and finalize issues and questions to be addressed the following three days.

During the three-day visitation, the team met individually or in groups with over 225 college faculty, classified staff, students, administrators and Governing Board members. Team members also visited day and evening classes, both on and off the campus, and held two sessions open to all members of the college community. The team very much appreciated the cooperation and candor demonstrated by faculty, staff and students throughout the visitation.

The previous accreditation team visit occurred in March of 1990. This was followed by an interim progress report, requested by the Commission, which the college submitted in April of 1991. The report addressed the delineation of functions between the Academic Senate and the faculty bargaining unit, and the establishment of mechanisms for appropriate involvement of campus constituencies in program review and planning and budgeting processes. Although the college has moved in many positive directions in response to the 1990 recommendations, a significant number of recommendations have not been adequately addressed.

The self-study report was visually attractive, well written and very user friendly. The team respected the serious and professional contributions to the project by many members of the college community. While the study was generally thorough and concise, many of the planning agendas lacked specificity. Often the planning agendas noted only the need and/or intention to plan.

The team was concerned early in the visit to be presented with allegations by key members of the administration and governing board members that the self-study report was biased and did not reflect an accurate view of the college. However, based on the self-study document, and all the additional information provided by interviews, observations, and college documents, the team was able to validate most of the self-study and accurately assess the strengths and weaknesses of the college relative to the accreditation standards.

Overall, the team was impressed with the high level of quality inherent throughout San Joaquin Delta College. The faculty and staff are dedicated and highly qualified, and the college is well known and respected for its excellent vocational and transfer programs. The college is financially sound, and has been able to weather the challenging fiscal times better than most California community colleges due to a long-standing history of excellent fiscal management. The campus is beautiful and very well maintained. The overwhelming majority of students are highly satisfied with their education and experiences at Delta, and the college has a highly favorable reputation throughout the district.

While it is clear that San Joaquin Delta College is fundamentally a very strong institution, the team identified a number of institutional shortcomings relative to the accreditation standards. The team's findings are detailed in the observations, conclusions and recommendations under each of the eight standard areas. The most serious and interrelated shortcomings which must be addressed by San Joaquin Delta College are outlined below:

- The college has made little or no progress in responding to many of the recommendations identified in the 1990 Accreditation Evaluation Report. Specifically, the college has not adequately addressed the following areas:

  a) a regular, standardized program review process
  b) effective assessment instruments for placement in Mathematics courses for new students
  c) procedures for evaluation of faculty which insure student input
  d) support for a quality library collection
  e) implement action of participation in shared governance
  f) an adequate delineation of roles and responsibilities

- Implementation of the shared governance requirements of AB 1725, which has been challenging for all California community colleges, has been particularly difficult for San Joaquin Delta College. Because of conflicts over shared governance, a growing list of planning, evaluation and decision-making issues are not being effectively addressed (including many of the recommendations of the previous team's recommendations).
- A systematic and integrated process of planning and evaluation, which involves all segments of the campus community, and influences the acquisition and allocation of resources, does not exist. Although preliminary work has begun on developing an integrated planning and budgeting system, much remains to be done.

If these circumstances are allowed to continue, they will unquestionably begin to negatively impact the quality of the college's programs and services, which as noted above, are outstanding. It is strongly recommended that the leadership of San Joaquin Delta College give the highest priority to addressing these issues.

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD ONE
Institutional Integrity
Purposes, Planning and Effectiveness

Response to the recommendations of the previous team:

In response to the previous visiting team's recommendation that the new Mission Statement be widely disseminated, the college publishes it in the college catalog and each semester in the class schedule. In response to the recommendation that the planning sessions of the Board be publicized to all staff, the college uses the same means and manner used for giving notice of regular Board meetings. The Board has recently developed a set of planning priorities which have been disseminated to the Planning/Budgeting Committee, other planning committees, managers, and campus constituencies through the President's Office.

The previous visiting team recommended that the then recently developed general policy on program review and evaluation be expanded into a set of specific quantifiable indicators for use by each unit of the college for regular, standardized program review. The college has taken some limited steps toward developing a viable and useful program review process. However, it has conducted only 11 inconsistent reviews since the last accreditation visit, and while it has developed a proposal for strengthening program review procedures, these have not been broadly agreed to nor have they been implemented. Program reviews are not being conducted on a systematic and regular basis nor even have quantifiable indicators been fully identified let alone produced for each of the College's instructional and student services programs. This recommendation and the standard to which it corresponds (Standard 1D.1B) remain unsatisfied.

Observations

This standard covers four categories that deal with the general institutional issues of integrity in actions, appropriateness and clarity of purposes, and existence and effectiveness of institutional planning and evaluation. Regarding institutional integrity, the team was able to validate most sections of the self-study. For example, Board Policy 6620 supports and safeguards the principle of academic freedom for faculty and students. Interviews with faculty and management indicated that there is full institutional support and protection for academic freedom. There is a clear statement of expectations concerning the principles of academic honesty and sanctions for violations in th*Student Handbook* and in the *Manual for Student Attendance and Grading*. Interviews and an inspection of the class schedule and course catalog validate the self study claim that the institution represents itself honestly and accurately to students and the public. The catalog contains all the appropriate information regarding admissions requirements and fees, courses, and program requirements. The team found no indication that the names and degrees of faculty and instructional administrators published in the -catalog are not presented honestly. The team did not validate that the athletic program demonstrates honesty and integrity. However, there is was no indication that this is not so.

A standard of institutional integrity also requires that the institution foster "an affirmative environment in which diversity is embraced and every person is treated with respect.- In regard to students, the team was able to validate that, as reported in the self study, the Delta College mission statement includes a commitment to educating students of all ages, genders, and ethnic backgrounds and that access for diverse ethnic groups has been achieved as evidenced by the close match between the ethnic makeup of the student and district populations. The college is to be commended for its efforts to recruit Hispanic students and to improve their representation among.the student population.

As a public California community college, the basic institutional purpose or mission of San Joaquin Delta College is set by the State in AB 1725. The current college statement of mission, contained in the catalog, conforms to this legislation. The team observed that there is a need, however, to continue to develop the college's basic directions or goals within this broad mission in order to address the future with the appropriate mix and emphasis of programs and services and the most effective allocation of scarce resources. The Planning Committee's recent identification of eight critical issues or goals is a substantial step in this direction.

The accreditation standards require that institutions have an established planning process that involves all segments of the campus community, that it use the results of institutional research, that it assist in identifying institutional priorities, and that it influence the acquisition and allocation of resources. As the self study indicates within the Standard I section and in a number of other appropriate places throughout the report, the college has yet to implement a fully functioning planning process that effectively uses program and institutional effectiveness research to guide resource allocation and the annual budgeting process. Nor has the college, as fully discussed in Standard 8 below, achieved a satisfactory sense of full participation of all segments of the campus community in institutional planning and budgeting. Nevertheless, the college has made and continues to make serious attempts to realize a vital and effective planning and budgeting process since the last team's visit. For example, the college produced the document *Planning for the Future* in early 1994 stating major planning assumptions, institutional goals, and operational plans for each of the major planning functions of the college.

It is evident to the team through interviews and inspection of documents that the College has engaged in serious and effective planning for a number of specific functions and within a number of units and departments. There have been, for example, excellent efforts in facilities, financial, and student equity planning. Most recently, a new comprehensive planning process has been outlined, eight critical planning goals have been identified, and the membership of the Planning and Budgeting Committees have been made the same in a creative attempt to insure the influence of planning on budgeting.

The team has also observed that the college has devoted significant resources to institutional research and has produced an impressive set of high quality research reports over the past six years. The team notes, as does the self-study, that with the notable exception of research for the student equity plan, the thrust of institutional research efforts has been concentrated on policy issues and Board concerns. Little research in the area of matriculation, instruction, and special projects, as noted recently by the Academic Research Committee, and in institutional and student outcomes has been conducted in recent years. This is partly because the college's research capacity has been reduced due to the loss of the position of Dean for General Education whose last incumbent coordinated and conducted research in these areas.

As also noted in this and other sections of the self-study, the college has yet to put in place an effective,

systematic, and regular program review and evaluation process. Only some limited efforts, most obviously the recent proposal for a new set of procedures, have been noted by the team to achieve this result.

Standard 1A.11 requires the institution to agree to comply with Commission standards, policies and self-study requirements. As will be noted throughout the remaining sections of this evaluation report, the team observed that the college has not fully and satisfactorily responded to many of the previous team's recommendations. In some cases, the team has been able to validate that substantial efforts and progress has been made regarding very complex and difficult challenges. For example, it is clear to the team that the college is working diligently to develop a sound, participatory planning and resource allocation process. Nevertheless, the team also observed a pattern of 11th hour attempts to address prior recommendations and in too many cases a significant lack of meaningful progress.

Conclusions

Delta College has fully met the standards in the area of institutional integrity with the exception of the standard relating to responding to visiting team recommendations. The college faces, as do all California community colleges, substantial challenges with respect to cultural and gender diversity. Demands for recognition and mutual sensitivity from all ethnic groups face all colleges and the wider society. The college is clearly committed to the goal of creating an environment that works for a diverse student body and staff and is taking appropriate actions to produce it.

The need to continue to develop an institutional planning and budgeting process that involves the effective participation of all campus segments is recognized by all campus leaders and groups. The college is to be commended for its repeated though thwarted attempts to achieve such a process and for succeeding in taking a number of important steps in recent years towards its development. Nevertheless, the next steps must be taken with a sense of urgency since a number of serious challenges are bearing down upon Delta College and indeed all California community colleges.

Program review at Delta College, as at many California community colleges, has not been effectively achieved as is well recognized and documented throughout the self-study. The college is urged to continue its efforts to develop a systematic and regular program review process that not only relies on quantifiable indicators that describe inputs and processes but also student learning and success outcomes.

Institutional research at Delta College is impressive in many ways. Nevertheless, many important aspects of institutional research and institutional effectiveness information are being neglected. While the present accreditation standards indicate the need for the use of outcomes information and research in planning and resource allocation, the emphasis is not strong. However, the next set of accreditation standards, now being circulated in near final draft form, and to which Delta College will be subject upon its next accrediting team visit, strongly emphasizes the development of and the use of outcomes research and information throughout the entire document. In light of these anticipated standards, increasing requirements for accountability in terms of outcomes, and just plain good planning and evaluation for institutional effectiveness, the team strongly suggests that Delta College develop and enhance its capacity to produce student outcomes research and information.

The team also concludes that Delta College has not in many cases, as documented in the remaining sections, responded appropriately to the previous team's recommendations. The team reluctantly reached

this conclusion because it calls into question the commitment of a fine institution to take seriously the recommendations of visiting evaluation teams, including this one.

Recommendations

1. The College should continue its efforts to develop an institutional planning process that guides and integrates functional, operational and unit plans, uses institutional effectiveness and outcomes information, and effectively guides resource allocation and annual budgeting. (1C)
2. The College should develop a systematic and regular program review process for educational programs, student services, and administrative services that uses standard quantifiable program evaluation indicators emphasizing information on student learning and program outcomes and results. (1D)
3. As the self-study clearly indicates, the College has not responded effectively and satisfactorily to a substantial proportion of the previous visiting team's recommendations. This calls into question the College's integrity regarding its relationship with the Accrediting Commission. The College should make the strongest efforts to immediately and substantially respond to the recommendations of the present visiting team. (1A.11)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD TWO
Educational Programs

Responses to the recommendations of the previous team:

Delta College has made little progress on many of the previous team's recommendations in this standard. While the self-study report acknowledges the need to make better progress, the slow pace of response concerned the team, as outlined below.

The previous team recommended "clarification of the program review process ... so that administrators and faculty have an understanding of the process and outcomes." Despite the request of the Commission for a progress report in 1991 on "establishment of mechanisms for appropriate involvement of campus constituencies in program review and planning and budgeting processes," the campus has yet to identify the elements, establish the shared governance mechanisms, or conduct program review. Only eleven programs have been reviewed since 1989. This conflicts with the college's own policy 6140, which states that "each instructional program should undergo a program review at least once each four years."

Also, the previous team recommended that the Mathematics Department consider an assessment instrument to insure proper placement in all mathematics courses for all entering students. The team cited student self selection beyond Math 80 and 83; this practice apparently continues, as does the low retention rate cited by the team.

Further, the previous team recommended that procedures for the evaluation of faculty be reviewed, in part to insure student participation. There is still no mechanism to insure that student evaluations are completed and submitted to instructors as the college's operating guidelines require.

The team noted the final recommendation by the previous team pertained to the further development of contract education. Contract education has in fact expanded its activity, particularly in what the college identifies as 'instructional agreements' with various outside agencies. These agreements are arrangements with outside education providers to administer college-sanctioned programs whereby the college pays for a portion of the instructional costs through fund disbursement to the sponsoring agency. College reimbursement is

accomplished through the submission of FTES apportionment claims. Programs appear to be academically sound and to serve an important economic development need for the community. However, the recommendation of the previous team that the college increase contract education in its more traditional sense, meaning fee-based training for local business and industry, was not implemented.

The team noted the college did make a decision regarding the college farm, as recommended by the previous team, by determining to keep the farm and by building an Agriculture classroom facility there. Also, significant progress has been made on the previous team's recommendation to improve articulation

with all feeder high schools.

Observation

San Joaquin Delta College meets the diverse needs of all its students by offering a comprehensive array of occupational, transfer and basic skills programs, as well as community service, older adult, and "contract education" programs via instructional agreements with outside agencies.

The college's curriculum is appropriate to its locale and student population; classrooms are exceptionally attractive and well equipped; and faculty, staff and students express pride in the wide array of offerings and the high quality of instruction which the college provides. The college enjoys a strong reputation in the community and state for excellent teaching, many unique programs, and quality student outcomes. In the expression of its fundamental purpose, which is instruction, this is an outstanding college.

Expectations are high that the new computer "System 2000" will make the database available which will be the foundation for program review, as well as other important planning processes.

Conclusion

The range and quality of educational opportunities provided by Delta are exemplary. The teaching/learning environment is stimulating, and cutting edge technology is being systematically employed throughout the instructional programs.

The college should be commended for the planning which brought state-of-the-art technology access to faculty, staff and students. Instructional applications of technology in various labs, from music to journalism, is to be commended, as well as the enthusiastic interest shown in faculty workshops on using technology to improve learning.

The college should also be commended for achieving a 75%-25% full-time/part-time faculty ratio, a statewide goal which few if any other colleges have met. In addition, improvements in faculty and staff diversity have resulted in a better learning environment for the multicultural student population at the college.

Having the Cal State Stanislaus presence on campus is a visible and effective way to maintain high transfer rates and stimulate student desire to continue in higher education. Activities such as Vision 2000 and specialty days such as Engineering Day are imaginative and inviting activities for high school students to be introduced to Delta.

The curriculum approval process and the program review process are highly problematic at the college. This appears to be due to conflicts over shared governance, described by some staff as a tug-of-war in which the administration let go in despair and anger. The Curriculum Committee is now composed almost entirely of faculty, with only two voting administrators, the Vice President of Instruction and Articulation Officer. The Deans and Division Chairs have no established role in curriculum & program approval, other than signing that they have seen proposals, even though they are responsible for associated funding and staffing changes. Related matters such as authorization for credit by exam, agreement on general education requirements, criteria for the associate degree, articulation agreements with the high schools, and course prerequisite and corequisite validations are either being postponed or

are being addressed with little or no institutional support. The result is ineffective decision-making or stalemate with the potential to harm students and programs.

Another area of serious concern lies in the college's "instructional agreements," by which FTES-bearing programs are conducted via contract to over twenty external agencies. These agreements provide an FTES cushion for the college, and help meet an important training need of the community. However, college staff expressed concern that teaching evaluations and curriculum oversight are not handled in a manner that is integrated and congruent with college processes as required in Accreditation Standard 2D. "All special courses and programs which include courses for credit whether conducted on- or off-campus are integral parts of the institution; their functions, goals, and objectives are consistent with other elements of the institution; they maintain the same academic standards as regular campus programs; and they are planned and evaluated by the same processes as the regular educational program.

Recommendations

1. Employ strategies for change that will enable more successful decision-making through shared governance, particularly in the curriculum review processes. (2B)
2. Review off pus instructional agreements for congruence with the college's mission and priorities. Integrate those agreements with college processes and college oversight. (2D)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD THREE
Student Services and the Co-Curricular
Learning Environment

Response to the recommendations of the previous team:

The prior visiting team made five recommendations in this standard, and all five have been addressed.

The first recommendation suggested that counseling hours be expanded in the evening, and the college has made additional hours of both counselor and advisor services available to evening students. The second recommendation was for additional articulation agreements to be completed with four-year colleges and universities, and a substantial list of additional agreements is provided in the self-study report.

The third recommendation suggested that student services areas make a planned, concerted effort to inform the college community of student services' relationship to the mission of the college. The student services staff has made a good beginning, in addressing this concern with a brochure describing services and with a memorandum addressed to all faculty from the vice president of student services. The memo frankly states the need to work cooperatively to serve Delta students and invites faculty to call on programs for support. A substantial improvement in understanding is unlikely to develop, however, without joint project or program efforts which produce visible results for students. Such cooperative efforts rely on the initiative of both the instructional staff and the student services staff for success. Numerous models exist for these efforts. This lack of cooperation and coordination between programs is still perceived to be a problem and is cited as such in the current self-study.

The fourth recommendation suggests that additional recruitment and retention efforts be provided, particularly for the various minority populations. Delta's enrollment statistics suggest that the adult population of the community is appropriately represented on campus, and the district's Student Equity Plan thoroughly addresses campus efforts to increase the retention and success of historically underrepresented or at-risk populations.

The fifth and final recommendation asked that the Student Handbook be made available to a larger number of students, possibly as a complement to the Orientation Guide. The college has responded by revising the handbook and making many more copies available throughout student services offices on campus.

Observations

A program review process for student services programs is still in the planning stage. The council is working to develop a comprehensive process which will measure activities, student satisfaction and outcomes of student services programs. This program review can be one vehicle for cooperative efforts

with instruction by including them in the process and using the results to demonstrate program effectiveness. The staff identifies the need for more institutional research on student characteristics and outcomes, which is necessary to support student services program review. The program review process can also be the vehicle for addressing other long range needs such as space allocation for student services and levels of staffing, particularly in counseling.

The college has chosen to offer very limited Health Services to students, partly due to funding constraints resulting from a large disadvantaged population. Restoring adequate funding for Health Centers is a state priority, and should changes in funding occur, the college should review the decision, weighing the relative benefits and costs of such a program.

The college has very clearly stated policies, procedures, student rights and responsibilities in the appropriate publications. The college is in the process of revising the grievance procedure and has instituted a confidentiality procedure for all staff who work with private student records. The student services programs are very positive about the comprehensive System 2000 computer support, particularly since it has been revised to be faster in operation.

The college has recently implemented an administrative reorganization of the student services programs. While the structure is relatively new, staff appear optimistic about its positive impact on working relationships and program effectiveness. Responsibility for matriculation has been relocated to the guidance department, with the exception of the assessment component. It is important that counselors have a closer involvement in the assessment and placement process.

The self study identifies participation of students in campus governance as an ongoing problem. Discussions with staff and student leaders indicate that there is some improvement in this area. The college is encouraged to continue to identify ways to improve student participation in governance and student activities.

The self-study reports results of student opinion surveys on a variety of programs. Through program review, the college might examine the areas with the smallest "agree" ratings and largest 'no opinion" ratings, such as placement, student activities, health services and grievance procedures. Placement and student activities should be well known to students and may require more promotion. The small response to health services and the grievance process may be reflective of the intentional small scope of these services.

Conclusions

The college provides a comprehensive collection of services to students, using technology where appropriate. The staff members are positive about their roles and take pride in a job well done. The self-study was thorough, with clear, concise descriptions. Planning agendas, however, were often lacking in specificity and stated only the need to plan.

The college is to be commended on the quality of the Student Equity Plan and the System 2000 computer support. The college is to be commended on the recent recognition of the Career Development Center by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. The team also commends the college for implementing the reorganization of the student services units and the progress in moving toward program review.

Recommendations

1. That student services and instructional staff implement a process that ensures the input of counselors in the assessment program and recognizes their role as facilitators of student decision-making in course placement recommendations, career and transfer goals. (3D)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD FOUR
Faculty and Staff

Responses to the recommendations of the previous team:

In response to the previous team's recommendations, the college has taken a variety of steps to demonstrate its commitment to Affirmative Action both in clearly articulated policy statements and in recent hirings. During the visit, various trustees, administrators, and other staff echoed this commitment. The college conducted a study to assess how accepting the college is of women and people of color. In addition, hiring procedures for part-time faculty have been revised, advertising of positions occurs, and--because current methods of advertising have not yielded the desired results-some discussions are currently under way of methods to implement targeted recruitment among under-represented groups.

Procedures regarding the hiring of contract faculty were amended in 1991 and (three times) in 1995. The part-time hiring procedure was amended in 1993, and the assessment of climate regarding women and people of color was also conducted in 1993. Progress in designing a targeted recruitment plan for part-time faculty seems minimal, perhaps because of frequent turnover in the position of Director of Affirmative Action.

With regard to the study "Attitudes on Staff Participation and the Acceptance of Women and Minorities at Delta College," it is true that figures for *total* results 'did not confirm the concerns of the visiting team," with respect to 'impressions associated with discrimination, sexism, and racism.' However, an examination of the responses of relevant subsets indicates that--at least in 1993-the concerns of the team had considerable merit.

Observations

Faculty and staff at Delta College are commendably well qualified and dedicated to excellence in teaching. The high quality, spirit, and dedication of the staff provide an enormous reservoir from which to draw in further strengthening the general efficacy of the college.

Policies and procedures for hiring are clear and well-written. Human Resources and Affirmative Action staff now meet with all hiring committees to orient them to required policies and procedures.

At the time of the visit, approximately 25% of the positions in the process of being filled were undergoing equivalency determinations, supporting the concern voiced in the self-study that equivalency is an issue in need of further scrutiny.

Discussion with a wide variety of individuals supported the assertion made in the self-study that the evaluation of management, faculty, and classified staff is a serious problem in need of immediate attention. All parties expressed dissatisfaction with both the tone surrounding evaluation and the

procedures in place, though policy and procedures are clear. Procedure calls for student evaluation as part of peer review although the self-study seems to indicate it is optional.

Active, commendable, and often innovative staff development programs are in place and are currently the subject of discussions about further refinement.

Equitable workload and position entitlement appear to be ongoing concerns.

In general, personnel policies and procedures are clear, comprehensive, and thorough, which supports the finding in the self-study that the process for developing these policies works well.

Conclusions

The college is to be commended for the sincere effort and the current results of its commitment to Affirmative Action, as evidenced by the increase in the representation of women and people of color in the faculty and administration. A related commendable change is the way in which second interviews are now handled: an enlarged interview committee contributes to a more collaborative approach to hiring. The fact that many teaching divisions have agreed to include multicultural material in their classes is also to be commended. There appears to be general agreement that, while progress has been made, much additional work needs to be done. The college should continue to make staff development activities relating to diversity widely available and should re-evaluate the training given to Affirmative Action representatives on hiring committees.

Certain portions of this section of the self-study would have benefited from greater clarity or specificity. The team had difficulty in understanding what areas of the college are understaffed and what efforts are being made to address that concern. Similar lack of clarity exists with regard to workload equity: the team understands that this is an ongoing issue but was not able to determine precisely who is affected. A related issue is that during the visit, many individuals commented on the long-overdue nature of a reclassification study for classified staff; the issue was not, however, addressed in the self-study. Another issue that needs to be clarified is the primacy of teaching effectiveness among the criteria for hiring. The length of time of the mini-presentation during the interview seems to be the focus of disagreement; however, as best the team was able to ascertain, each hiring committee has great latitude in malting such decisions. Relevant planning agendas recommend that these issues be addressed. The team concurs and suggests that responsible individuals be appointed in the near future and that timelines for completion be set.

The sections dealing with planning were, with few exceptions, intentions to plan or recommendations to plan rather than actual plans. This may have been the result of instructions from the steering committee (there were indications that subcommittees were told to use these sections for recommendations) or this may be symptomatic of the college-wide weakness in planning.

Recommendations

1. In light of suggestions made by the previous team, the college should, as expeditiously as possible, undertake revision of all aspects of personnel evaluation. In particular, staff should devise mechanisms to ensure that evaluation of personnel at all levels occur regularly, that faculty evaluation routinely include student input, and that improvement plans be monitored for

follow-up. (4C.1)

2. The college should undertake a. new study similar to the 1993 "Attitudes on Staff Participation and the Acceptance of Women and Minorities at Delta College" to determine if perceptions have changed and to target specific staff development activities which address issues affecting these groups. (4A.4)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD FIVE
Library and Learning Resources

Responses to the recommendations of the previous team:

Two recommendations were made by the last accreditation team. One half of the first recommendation has been addressed. The library has been able to automate most services in the library and has on-line access to the library at the two largest centers located in Manteca and Tracy. Students and staff now have access to the collections in the public library as well as to the University of the Pacific by using the Delta automated system. Students can borrow material from College of the Pacific for a modest fee. There is a delivery system in place to send requested materials to the centers from the library. Significant financial resources have been allocated to complete this project.

No progress has been made in the second half of recommendation #1. While library technology has been well supported, the college has not addressed the need for adequate funds to maintain a quality collection, and has not made a commitment to provide sufficient funds except when one-time dollars have come to the college. Because of the uncertain funding, the library staff has had to reduce the number of periodical titles and current books it can purchase. There is no plan to increase the base funding for library materials at this time.

The previous team's recommendation to systematically involve faculty in collection development has been satisfactorily addressed. Faculty requests for materials to support their classes are purchased as a first priority in ordering new materials.

Observations

The college is to be commended for the excellent use of technology to support instruction in all areas of learning resources - the library, the audio-visual department, the learning labs, and the duplicating facility.

The library and learning resources areas are using information technology in creative ways that benefit students and staff both at the main campus and at the centers in Manteca and Tracy. It would benefit students at the other centers similarly if available.

Integrating four circulation desks (reserves, circulating books, periodicals and videos) into one is an innovative idea. It is suggested that the library staff review with the library director the changes that have been made and modify the area as necessary.

The library and learning resources areas, including the television studio, the audiovisual department and the duplicating facility, would benefit from a replacement schedule for hardware and software and a line item in the budget for this that takes into account inflation.

Conclusions

As stated in the self-study, so few new books have been purchased that students do not have the up-to-date information they need for class assignments.

Recommendations

1. As was recommended by the prior accreditation team, the college should provide up-to-date library materials to support the curriculum and student learning. (5A.1)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD SIX
Physical Resources

Responses to recommendations from the previous team:

The Self-Study has satisfactorily addressed two of the three recommendations of the prior team contained in Standard Six. The third prior team recommendation deals with institutional priorities and the need to relate resource allocation to the college's long-range planning. The response acknowledges the need to improve the linkage and refers the reader to Chapter One of the Self-Study. Evaluation of the college response to this recommendation is contained in Standard One.

Observations

Delta College is an attractive physical plant that shows the result of significant effort over the past five years to address maintenance and infrastructure needs. The emphasis on reducing the deferred maintenance backlog is well described in the self-study and acknowledged by staff. The buildings appear to be well-maintained and the grounds are attractively designed and maintained. The college regularly submits funding requests for capital outlay and deferred maintenance projects to the State.

The college currently has two major construction projects in progress--completion of a small classroom building on the farm and a major infrastructure improvement comprised of a central plant (HVAC) facility and installation of an underground distribution system which also provides conduit for data and voice communication cabling. Both of these projects are locally funded, the latter being funded by the issuance of debt, expected to be repaid through the savings in utility costs. According to staff the level of expected savings was carefully studied and validated by three separate external sources and in each case it was confirmed that the savings would cover debt service costs.

One concern mentioned in the self-study, but not addressed, was that of personal safety on campus. The self-study indicates that all groups (classified, faculty, and managers) have a significant number of employees who feel the campus is not safe and secure. This is especially prevalent with classified employees--42% of whom responded they did not feel safe.

Conclusions

Staff interviewed about Standard 6 confirmed the descriptions and findings of the self-study. The college obviously has a well thought-out plan to continue the fine maintenance program. The college is proud of the shared use of its facilities with community groups and organizations. The college is to be commended for the management and care of its facilities and the obvious priority placed on protection of the public's investment in its facilities.

Recommendation

1. The college should develop a process to follow-up on the concerns expressed about safety, identify specific problem areas, and develop a plan to resolve the concerns. (6A.4)

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD SEVEN
Financial Resources

Responses to previous team recommendation:

The previous team made three (3) recommendations. Two have been responded to in the self-study in a satisfactory manner. A third was a recommendation that a process be developed to include broad-based participation in the budget development process which includes faculty and staff input. The response indicates that there is still considerable dissatisfaction with the level of participation in budgeting. The current team confirms that this dissatisfaction exists and recognizes that the issue of participation in the budget process is symptomatic of a larger dissatisfaction with the way in which shared governance is viewed and implemented (or not, as the case may be) at the college. More in depth discussions of this problem and attendant recommendations may be found in the reports of the team on Standard One and Standard Eight.

Observations

The manner in which the financial resources of the college are managed is to be commended. The team found that, among those faculty and staff interviewed, an acknowledgment that the business affairs of the college are handled properly, efficiently, and with integrity. College resources are sufficient to maintain its programs and services; debt is appropriately managed; and appropriate attention is paid to cash flow requirements. Reserves meet or exceed the recommendations of the State. Staff produces quarterly financial statements which are presented to the Board. College financial records are audited by external auditors and the audits are clear and contain no exceptions.

Most of the concerns heard by the team involve process. The team acknowledges and supports the action which combined the Budget and Planning committees. Team interviews revealed that, while optimism would be an overstatement, there is hope that this is a step in the right direction toward giving credibility to the effort to join budgeting and planning. Interviews with members of the standard sub-committee and Budget/Planning committee revealed a belief that some real progress is being made. Having said that, the team also views the assertion of the self-study (p.7-4) that the "...District has vigorously implemented the mandates of AB 1725, especially as they pertain to shared governance" as an overstatement.

Conclusion

The team concludes that the college is financially well managed. The general dissatisfaction with shared governance is felt in the budgeting process, although there appears to be some progress in this regard. While the team has no specific recommendation relative to Standard Seven, the recommendations contained in Standards One and Eight regarding planning and shared governance also apply to this

standard.

Recommendations

1. No specific recommendations.

This report represents the findings of the evaluation team that visited
San Joaquin Delta College on March 25-28, 1996

STANDARD EIGHT
Governance and Administration

Response to the recommendations of the previous team:

Of the five recommendations from the previous team, there remain three main areas that have not been addressed satisfactorily. The first deals with the lack of effectiveness of the shared governance model. The team notes the addition of faculty, staff, and students to various college committees, including the Budget Committee and the President's Council. However, while there has been some progress in the area of participation by faculty and staff in the major budget and policy decisions of the college, there is still much work to be done.

This team also expresses its concern over the lack of resolution in the delineation of roles and responsibilities between the Academic Senate and faculty union, and between the Classified Senate and the classified union. While it may continue to serve the interest of these constituencies, it is an area of some concern to the team, given the appearance of conflict of interest. The appearance of a conflict of interest is exacerbated by the fact that the presidents of each organization sit as ex-officio members on each other's executive committee. A "progress report" in 1991 on this matter submitted at the request of the Commission failed to satisfy the concerns of the current team.

The third major area of recommendations which has not been adequately addressed is communication. Several comments dealing with written as opposed to personal contact by members of the administration are noted, along with unsuccessful attempts to remedy this problem. Efforts in this area should continue, perhaps by more clearly defining what "communication" means to the various parties involved. Other avenues of communication, such as personal contacts, small group discussions, and electronic mail, should be explored.

Observations

It is clear to the team that a great deal of work remains to be done by all major college constituencies in the area of shared governance and communication. The widely divergent views and perceptions of faculty, staff and administration which were encountered make it difficult to differentiate fact from fiction from fantasy. It is imperative that much careful thought, planning, and cooperation be put into correcting the problems perceived in the various subsections of this standard. It is also extremely important that every constituency come to a clear and collegial understanding that the vital work of teaching and learning and serving students must not be compromised by internecine warfare. The college is to be commended on some attempt to explore programs such as CFIER which may help with trust and community building. The spirit of shared governance will be very difficult to achieve without the creation of a collegial atmosphere in which to work.

The team is appropriately impressed by the general feeling that students are receiving an excellent

education in a caring and nurturing environment. Administration, faculty, and staff are to be commended for keeping students first.

The team recognizes the relatively new membership of the Board and notes their procedures of self-evaluation, ethics statement, and evaluation of the President on an annual basis. After consultation with the President, the Board may consider making the President's evaluation a more inclusive process. Further, the team is pleased to learn of the Board's decision to become more involved in future accreditations. Mention should also be made of the success this Board and administration have had in insuring fiscal stability.

Conclusions

Throughout the team's involvement with this standard, it has become clear that shared governance in its present form is not responding to the needs of the institution. No institution as fine as SJDCC could have achieved its outstanding reputation and accomplishments without a firm sense of community, cooperation, and caring. What has evidently been a strength of this college is in danger of being lost. The Standard Eight self-study section is a generally comprehensive and descriptive document dealing with governance and administration. In many cases, however, as in other standards, the planning agendas are only suggestions, without a sense of commitment or plan to address the issues raised.

Recommendations

1. A concerted effort should be undertaken to reestablish the sense of community, teamwork, and trust which led to the great successes of the institution. Therefore, the entire design and implementation of shared governance should be revisited with a timeline to establish an effective and broad based process which satisfies the requirements and spirit of AB 1725. (8B.1, 8C.1, 8D.1, 8E.2, 8F.2)
2. The team encourages the various college segments, including the president, administration, faculty, staff and the board, to abandon their confrontational culture and explore ways of increasing their effectiveness and collegiality. (8B. 1, 8C.1, 8D.1, 8D.4, 8E.2, 8F.2)